

Additional Comments on “New Limits on Spin-Independent Couplings of Low-Mass WIMP Dark Matter with a Germanium Detector at a Threshold of 200 eV”

F.T. Avignone III^a, P.S. Barbeau^b and J.I. Collar^{b,*}

^a*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208*

^b*Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics and Enrico Fermi Institute,
University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637*

**Corresponding author. E-mail: collar@uchicago.edu*

In a previous comment [1] we criticized purely technical aspects of [2] but pointed out that many other inconsistencies were readily apparent. In view of the imminent posting of another version of [2], still containing these issues, we would like to offer with this additional note a critical guide to the methodology followed by the TEXONO collaboration, in their effort to extract dark matter limits from a spectral region completely dominated by electronic noise. We find that systematics have been neglected through a combination of erroneous assumptions and failure to explore all of their possible sources.

We should start by briefly putting the TEXONO method and results in perspective (in what follows all calls to figures or tables are for those in [2] unless otherwise stated). The raw counting rate in their ULEGe detectors prior to any data treatment is approximately 2×10^7 , 7×10^5 and 3.5×10^3 counts / keV kg day in the bins spanning 0.1-0.2, 0.2-0.3 and 0.3-0.4 keV of ionization energy, respectively [3]. In the region entirely clear of the electronic noise (0.4-1 keV) this raw rate plateaus to $\sim 10^3$ counts / keV kg day. Following a method of pulse shape discrimination (PSD) delineated further down, regions below threshold undergo a large stripping of what TEXONO claims is reliably mostly noise signals, supposedly preserving a significant fraction of true events. The bulk of this reduction is due to PSD and not vetoing from active elements in the shielding. The TEXONO collaboration then arbitrarily selects a 43 eV-wide energy region (0.198-0.241 keV) for their light WIMP analysis, where the original $\sim 100,000$ raw events have been reduced to exactly zero by the effect of cumulative cuts (Table I). It is important to remark that similarly-sized neighboring regions contain a significantly larger number of surviving counts (e.g., five counts in the 0.241-0.300 keV region), i.e., TEXONO has selected this extremely narrow energy region in order to obtain the best possible light-WIMP sensitivity (see discussion below). TEXONO maintains that the error bars in the residual spectrum are eminently statistical (of order 50%), dominating over systematic components.

We list below some of the systematic effects that have been neglected, and some of the assumptions that have been erroneously made. This list is by no means complete, for a close study of [2] reveals many open questions. In the interest of keeping this note in the realm of the readable, we limit ourselves to the most relevant issues only.

- The language used in [2] would lead the unsuspect-

ing reader to believe that “software was devised to differentiate physics events from those due to electronic noise”, leading to “the noise events being (were) suppressed”. The PSD method chosen to reject anomalous pulses has been extensively used in previous dark matter and low-background experiments [4, 5, 6, 7] with the clear difference that no collaboration before has dared to apply it well into the electronic noise pedestal. That such prudence is advisable should become clear in what follows. The PSD method in question consists of comparing preamplifier signals routed through two shaping amplifiers with different time constants. Anomalous pulses such as microphonics (independently confirmed as such in [4]) are observed to exhibit different amplitudes (assigned energies) in these two channels, leading to their elimination. TEXONO offers no references to any previous use of this method. They have nevertheless unnecessarily adulterated it by obtaining energy information from the two channels using a slightly different approach for each. That these are “partial” and “total integration” is the sum of the details offered in [2]. Under our scrutiny, this adds no benefit to the method: much to the contrary, in private communications [3] we have learned that through non-linearities it may lead to a disagreement in the energy calibration between the two channels at the crucial low-energies. If confirmed this would manifestly defeat the validity of the method. Unfortunately such issues are veiled in Fig. 2b by choosing to represent the energy scale in one channel in keV and the other in arbitrary units. While we appeal to the TEXONO collaboration to be much clearer and extensive about critical points like this one, the bone of contention is a different one: contrary to what is stated in [2] the method described above is not capable of differentiating a “physics” signal from an electronic noise event at very low energies, well into the threshold. Both look the exact same. The reader should keep in mind that this is not the same situation as in other dark matter experiments, where calibrations allow to clearly distinguish desired recoil signals from minimum ionizing backgrounds, based on PSD. We invite the reader to inspect the discussion around Fig. 7 in [5], the first description of the method in [4], and its conventional use in [6, 7]. Even in such a dire situation, it may still be possible to apply an *entirely arbitrary* set of PSD cuts based on this method, as long as signal acceptance losses can be calculated and a correction to recover from those can be applied. This is the approach followed by TEXONO, in principle acceptable if it could be prop-

erly implemented. However, we strongly emphasize that the intrinsic arbitrariness in the placement of these cuts (see Fig. 2b) is in itself a source of systematic effects and errors, and therefore worthy of an investigation. This is absent in [2].

- The TEXONO collaboration utilizes two methods to calculate signal acceptance losses from PSD cuts. In the first they expose their ULEGs to several low-energy x-ray sources. No attempt is made to extract the spectral response to the sources from a comparison to background runs. Instead it is simply *assumed* that the response should be a flat spectrum below threshold (< 0.3 keV). A comparison between this assumed spectrum and the spectral shape of data passing PSD cuts (Fig. 2a) is used to contribute to the correction curve for signal losses (black squares in Fig. 3). The lightheartedness with which this assumption is made is regrettable, for it negates a very large body of work in the area of x-ray detector response to low-energy photons. This response is a complex function of atomic and electron physics, detector structure and operating conditions, electronic contact design, window material, etc., and generally results into what is anything but a flat distribution for sub-keV energies [8]. Several processes leading to partial energy deposition or charge collection are readily evident in the drastically raised plateau below the highest calibration peak in Fig. 2a, even if the spectrum is cut off immediately above in the figure.

- This first method of calculation of signal acceptance loss is clearly invalid in its present form. A very complex and dedicated effort would be necessary to extract more reliable information about the true low-energy response to the x-ray calibration sources, as indicated in the few example references in [8]. TEXONO exploits a second approach, which is to utilize low-energy events coincident with the vetoes as bona fide radiation-induced events. While this is a well-known technique [5], these coincident events are, we insist, in no other way distinguishable from electronic noise. This rises the question of what (energy-dependent) fraction of these are spurious noise coincidences with the vetoes, again a source of systematic errors. Others could be cited at this point: for instance, given the different response of the detector to events happening in or near the contacts [8] (here most of the detector surface) such as external x-rays and betas, only sufficiently delayed coincidences should be used to insure a sampling with recoil-inducing neutrons. There is no indication that this has been taken into account. However, the most important fact is that this second method generates on its own a large uncertainty in the signal acceptance curve (“ACV tag” in Fig. 3). This larger systematic impacts by itself the dark matter sensitivity and should generate relaxed limits.

- We are intrigued by the peculiar way in which the quenching factor (QF) and its uncertainty have been evaluated. Rather than relying on the good-quality experimental data available for the relevant low-energy region (see Fig. 4 in [5]), TEXONO has used an outdated version of a simulation code, assessing experimental data out to 200 keV to, in some way, estimate an uncertainty

in its output at 200 eV. That the Lindhard theory for the QF in germanium diverges at low and high recoil energies is clearly exposed in [9], a reference TEXONO cites. We also notice how the most recent low-energy data, those in [5], have not been considered. All low-energy germanium QF measurements (four experiments, spanning 0.25-5 keV in recoil energy) are in excellent agreement. The route of fitting these relevant data instead would lead to a well-defined non-arbitrary uncertainty for the QF. This more natural assessment of the QF can have a large effect in the claimed light-WIMP sensitivity. TEXONO should be cautious on the subject of this very important source of systematic error. A measurement of their own would be welcome.

- No method used to extract dark matter limits has ever gained universal acceptance. Fits using background models, no matter how reasonable, can be criticized for making some assumptions but then again lauded for employing all of the information in the region of interest, minimizing the beneficial rainfall from a favorable statistical fluke in some spectral region. Methods such as the unbinned optimal interval utilized by TEXONO have encountered the exact opposite commentary, conservative on one front and daring on the other. There is however a degree of audacity involved in its use on a spectral region just 43 eV wide, surrounded by wildly fluctuating concentrations of residual events, following a complete stripping of the raw data by five orders of magnitude, based on arbitrary cuts. For one thing, the degree of gain stability over time required for this may well be insufficient (“less than 5%” is mentioned, but unfortunately no reference energy is provided). At a minimum, in this extreme case a study of sensitivity as a function of chosen analysis region seems in order. A further comment is indicated, which is that rarely a dark matter search attempts an analysis after an exposure of just 0.34 kg-days, precisely to reinforce the robustness of any method chosen to extract limits.

By daring to go where all other dark matter experiments have balked, TEXONO should expect a very high level of scrutiny for their claims. We invite them to use a more conservative approach. Even if the PSD method employed in [2] has been available for long, all other experiments have consistently chosen to rely on noise abatement on hardware to reduce thresholds and increase sensitivity to light WIMPs. It should be clear from the discussion above that the kind of exercise attempted by TEXONO requires an extraordinary control of all systematic effects and a complete absence of assumptions and bias. Notice we have not dwelled on the effect of the ordering of the signal cuts (for which contradictory information between text and table can be found in [2]) or choice of integration times. An extensive list would be far too long.

In our opinion, the methodology followed in [2] is clearly flawed. The results, as presented, untenable. At this point we invite the interested reader to develop his or her own opinion.

N.B.: We cannot help but notice in [2] a reference to ~ 1 kg p-type point contact (PPC) detectors [5, 7]

like those now under consideration by the CoGeNT and MAJORANA collaboration, under the description of “a new design in ULEGe”. “ULEGe” is the commercial brand name for Canberra’s line of tiny n-type germanium

x-ray devices, used and proposed until now by TEXONO, and hardly a “novel detector”. From a technological point of view, ULEGes and PPCs share little more than a common target material.

-
- [1] F.T. Avignone *et al.*, [arXiv:0806.1341v1](#).
 - [2] S.T. Lin *et al.*, [arXiv:0712.1645v2](#).
 - [3] H. Wong, private communication.
 - [4] J. Morales *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A321** (1992) 410 (suggested by F.S. Goulding, at the 1st Workshop on Low Background Experiments, Berkeley, December, 1989).
 - [5] P.S. Barbeau *et al.*, JCAP **09** (2007) 009 ([arXiv:nucl-ex/0701012](#)).
 - [6] L. Baudis *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A418** (1998) 348; A. Morales *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B532** (2002) 8; Astropart. Phys. **16** (2002) 325; P. Benes *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A569** (2006) 737.
 - [7] C.E. Aalseth *et al.*, [arXiv:0807.0879](#).
 - [8] B.G. Lowe, Nucl. Instr. Meth **A439** (2000) 247; M.C. Lepy *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth **A439** (2000) 239; Nucl. Instr. Meth **A505** (2003) 290.
 - [9] K.W. Jones and H.W. Kraner, Phys. Rev. **A11** (1975) 1347.